DIRECT TESTIMONY

OF

MARY H. EVERSON

ACCOUNTING DEPARTMENT
FINANCIAL ANALYSIS DIVISION
ILLINOIS COMMERCE COMMISSION

AMERITECH ILLINOIS
INVESTIGATION INTO ALTERNATIVE REGULATION PLAN

DOCKET NOS.98-0252/0335 (CONSOL.)

NOVEMBER 3, 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Vitness Identification	1
Purpose of Testimony	2
Directory Revenue	3
ncentive Compensation	4
Social and Service Club Dues	6
Advertising Expense	7
External Relations	9
Conclusion	10

WITNESS IDENTIFICATION

- 1 Q. Please state your name and business address.
- 2 A. My name is Mary H. Everson. My business address is 527 East Capitol Avenue,
- 3 Springfield, Illinois 62701.
- 4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
- 5 A. I am an Accountant in the Accounting Department of the Financial Analysis Division
- 6 of the Illinois Commerce Commission.
- 7 Q. Please describe your background.
- 8 A. I have a Bachelor of Science in Accounting from the University of Central Florida. I
- 9 am a Certified Public Accountant licensed to practice in the State of Illinois. I joined
- the Staff of the Illinois Commerce Commission in February 1999. Prior to joining
- 11 Staff, I was employed in industry as a financial analyst and in government as an
- internal auditor.
- 13 Q. What is the function of the Accounting Department of the Illinois Commerce
- 14 **Commission?**
- 15 A. The Department's function is to monitor the financial condition of public utilities as
- 16 part of the Commission's responsibilities under Article IV of the Public Utilities Act
- and to provide accounting expertise on matters before the Commission.

18 Q. What are your responsibilities in this case?

19 A. The Director of the Accounting Department of the Commission has assigned me to
20 this case and defined the scope of my responsibilities. In this case I am to review
21 Ameritech Illinois' ("Company" or "AI") filing, analyze the underlying data, and
22 propose adjustments when appropriate.

PURPOSE OF TESTIMONY

23

24

Q. What is the purpose of this testimony?

25 Α. The purpose of my testimony is to present adjustments to Al's directory revenue, 26 incentive compensation plan, social and service club dues, advertising expense and 27 external relations. These adjustments would be used to determine a revenue 28 requirement if the Commission should decide to return to rate of return regulation of 29 Ameritech. These adjustments are used in the computation of the revenue 30 requirement in Staff Exhibit 5.0. My adjustments to Al's operating income are 31 included in Staff Exhibit 5.0, Schedule 5.02. My adjustments to rate base are 32 included in Staff Exhibit 5.0, Schedule 5.04.

33 Q. Are you sponsoring any schedules as part of Staff Exhibit 7.0?

A. Yes. I prepared the following schedules for the Company, which show data as of, or for the test year ending December 31, 1999:

37	Adjustment Schedules	
38	Schedule 7.01	Directory Revenue
39	Schedule 7.02	Incentive Compensation Plan
40	Schedule 7.03	Social and Service Club Dues
4 1	Schedule 7.04	Advertising Expense
1 2	Schedule 7.05	External Relations

43 **DIRECTORY REVENUE**

- 44 Q. Please explain Staff Exhibit 7.0, Schedule 7.01, Directory Revenue.
- 45 Α. Schedule 7.01, Directory Revenue, presents my adjustment to the Company's 46 revenues for the imputed revenue ordered to be included in the Company's prior 47 case, Illinois Bell Telephone Company, ICC Docket Nos. 92-0448/93-0239, 48 (Consol.), dated October 11, 1994. In 92-0448/93-0239, the Commission found 49 that Ameritech had rendered Illinois Bell's negotiating position worthless by 50 guaranteeing that the 1984 Directory Services contract with Donnelly, then up for 51 renewal or re-negotiation, would be renewed without a change in terms. On pages 52 101 and 103 of the 92-0448/93-0239 Order, the Commission states:

The Commission finds that during the 1990 negotiations which involved IBT's exclusive option to renew the directories agreement, IBT, Ameritech, and API failed to engage in arms length negotiations. Instead, Ameritech and API used IBT's option as bargaining leverage in negotiating an agreement that benefited only

58 API - Ameritech's unregulated subsidiary. This was done to the 59 detriment of IBT – Ameritech's regulated subsidiary. By diverting 60 the contract revenues from IBT to API, Ameritech shareholders 61 received a windfall by not having the revenues count towards IBT's 62 revenue requirements. 63 Furthermore, the Commission concludes that staff's \$51 million 64 upward adjustment to revenues received by IBT from its directory 65 relationship is necessary to prevent any harm to IBT's ratepayers 66 from Ameritech's cross-subsidization of revenues from IBT to API. 67 In the Order, the Commission found in favor of Staff's adjustment to directory 68 revenue of \$51,000,000 and ordered that it be included in the Company's revenue 69 requirement. In the current proceeding, Staff believes that an adjustment is 70 necessary to restore the revenues determined to be appropriate for ratemaking 71 purposes as determined in Docket Nos. 92-0448/93-0239, (Consol.). Absent the 72 necessary financial data to impute current directory revenue, Staff will use the total 73 amount determined to be appropriate in the last docket, \$126,000,000 (\$75M) 74 directory contract + \$51M imputed directory revenue). INCENTIVE COMPENSATION 75 76 Q. Please explain Staff Exhibit 7.0, Schedule 7.02, Incentive Compensation 77 Plan. 78 Α. Schedule 7.02 presents my adjustment to reduce operating expense and rate base 79 related to the management incentive compensation plan. 80 Q. Please explain your reason for disallowing the amounts associated with 81 incentive compensation.

82 Α. The Company's plan is based on financial performance goals of return on assets 83 and revenue growth. Inherent in these type of goals is a circular reasoning which 84 clearly benefits the shareholders, but not the ratepayers. The circular reasoning is 85 that the larger the increase in base rates granted, the greater the chances that 86 Ameritech Illinois will meet the financial goals. Since the performance goals are 87 based on the financial success of the Company, the larger the incentive 88 compensation awards. This circle is never ending. This process, while providing 89 benefits to the shareholders, provides little benefit to ratepayers, since the cost of 90 the plan is included in the rate base and the revenue requirement regardless of whether the performance goals are met or not.

Q. Has the Commission accepted similar adjustments for incentive compensation in prior orders?

91

92

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

Α. Yes. In Illinois Power Company Docket No. 93-0183, the Commission concluded that since financial goals benefit shareholders, ratepayers should not have to bear the cost:

> Two of the goals, earnings per share and reduced O & M expenses are goals that benefit shareholders. If the shareholders are the ones to benefit, they should be the ones who foot the bill.

In another docket, MidAmerican Energy Company Docket No. 99-0534, the Commission reached a similar conclusion regarding ratepayer benefit from incentive compensation based on financial goals:

¹ Order, Illinois Power Company Docket No. 93-0138, dated April 6, 1994, p. 52.

DOCKET NOS. 98-0252/0335 (CONSOL.) STAFF EXHIBIT 7.0

The Commission is not convinced that the ratepayers are protected in the event that the targeted return on capital investment is not achieved. Ratepayers would still fund the projected levels of incentive compensation even if that level is not achieved.²

For the reasons outlined in the previous paragraphs, I am reducing the amount of rate base and operating expense related to incentive compensation payments because these payments produce no benefit to ratepayers.

SOCIAL AND SERVICE CLUB DUES

110

111

112

Q. Please describe Staff Exhibit 7.0, Schedule 7.03, Social and Service Club Dues.

113 Α. Schedule 7.03 presents my adjustment to remove social and service organization 114 dues from the Company's expenses. Participation in these groups is a promotional 115 and goodwill practice that is not necessary to provide utility service. The 116 Commission, in its Order in Commonwealth Edison Company, Docket No. 90-117 0169, recognized the importance of utility companies participating in these types of 118 organizations, yet held that the shareholders, rather than the ratepayers, should bear 119 the cost of participating in these organizations. The Commission, in its Orders in 120 Commonwealth Edison, Docket No. 94-0065, dated January 9, 1995 and in Central 121 Illinois Public Service Company, Docket No. 99-0121, dated August 25, 1999, 122 affirmed this position in ruling to remove the cost of these types of membership

² Order, MidAmerican Energy Company Docket No. 99-0534, dated July 11, 2000, p. 9.

dues. Therefore, I am adjusting the Company's operating expense to reflect the removal of these dues.

ADVERTISING EXPENSE

123

124

125

126

127

128

129

130

131

132

133

134

135

136

137

138

139

140

141

Α.

Q. Please explain Staff Exhibit 7.0 Schedule 7.04, Advertising Expense.

Schedule 7.04 presents Staff's adjustment to reduce test year operating expense by the amount of advertising expense because the Company did not provide evidence that the advertising was not promotional. Staff requested supporting documentation for advertising expense in SDR-040, DLH-011, MHE-006, MHE-007, MHE-024 and MHE-025. In its response to data requests MHE-006 and 007, the Company indicated that information related specifically to each advertising campaign or series of advertisements is not identified, tracked or reported for either internal or external purposes. The Company further indicated that the expenses related to advertising are included in accounts 6611, 6612, and 6613. However, in response to later data requests, MHE-024 and MHE-025, which requested information specific to yellow pages advertising, the Company was able to provide information related to that one type of advertising. Given this inconsistency in the Company's responses, Staff is unable to rely on any of the responses to data requests for advertising information. Therefore, Staff determined that another approach to the advertising issue was necessary.

According to the Uniform System of Accounts ("USOA"), account 6612 is to be used for costs incurred in selling products and services, and account 6613 is to be used for costs incurred for product advertising.

The Public Utilities Act defines promotional advertising that is prohibited for utility companies: Section 9-225(1)(c) and in 83 III. Adm. Code 295.10(a) prohibits inclusion of operating expenses related to promotional advertising in determining a public utility's revenue requirement. Promotional advertising is defined in that section as follows:

Unless the Commission otherwise orders, no electric or gas utility shall include as an operating expense in the test year computation any direct or indirect expenditures for promotional, political, institutional or good will advertising. In determining whether to allow a variation from this provision, the Commission shall consider, among other things, whether the advertising at issue is necessary to protect consumers, to promote more efficient use of the public utility's system, or to allow the public utility to compete effectively against non-regulated competitors.

The Company did not furnish the information requested to prove that amounts included in Ameritech Exhibit 7.0 Schedules 1 and 2 are expenditures for non-promotional advertising allowable advertising expense.³ From the extremely limited information provided by the Company, Staff is unable to determine the exact nature and purpose for the company's advertising expenditures. Therefore, Staff relied on the USOA as a guide to the types of expenses to be charged to each account, and determined that the total amounts in accounts 6612 and 6613 should be removed to prevent inclusion of non-allowable product and promotional advertising. Should the

³ Allowable in rates recovered from ratepayers according to Section 9-225 of the Public Utilities Act, 83 III. Adm. in. Code Sections 275 and 295.

Company be able to provide detailed information on each advertising campaign expense for review, Staff is willing to consider that information. However, without the necessary detail regarding advertising expense, the total amount must be removed to prevent the ratepayers from having to pay for the Company's product promotion and sales expenses.

EXTERNAL RELATIONS

Α.

Q. Please explain Staff Exhibit 7.0 Schedule 7.05, External Relations.

Schedule 7.05 presents my adjustment to reduce test year operating expense by the amount of external relations expense because amounts charged to this account are related to corporate image advertising, review of pending legislation, public relations and investor relations activities. These types of activities do not produce benefits to the captive ratepayers, but instead, boost the corporate image, which benefits only the shareholders. As stated above in the Advertising Expense section of this testimony, the Public Utilities Act Section 9-225(1) outlines promotional advertising that is prohibited for utility companies, and 83 III. Adm. Code 295.10(a) prohibits inclusion of operating expenses related to promotional advertising in determining a public utility's revenue requirement. The Public Utilities Act defines goodwill or institutional advertising as follows in section 9-225(d):

"Goodwill or institutional advertising" means any advertising either on a local or national basis designed primarily to bring the utility's name before the general public in such a way as to improve the image of the utility or to promote controversial issues for the utility or the industry. Ameritech's external relations activities that are charged to account 6722 fall within
this definition. Therefore, due to the goodwill and promotional nature of these
expenses, amounts in account 6722 should be removed from test year operating
expense. For these reasons I am proposing to adjust external relations expense.

CONCLUSION

194

- 195 Q. Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?
- 196 A. Yes, it does.